



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

<b>Applicant</b>	Rancho California Water District	<b>County</b>	Riverside
<b>Project Title</b>	Temecula Valley Basin Groundwater Management Plan	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$ 188,438.00
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$ 334,870.00

**Project Description:** The Proposal develops a groundwater management plan for the Temecula Valley Basin. Tasks include conducting data collection and review of existing Basin data, determining data gaps, identifying projects and programs to meet goals, and conducting public hearings for formal plan adoption.

### Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	5
Work Plan	10
Budget	3
Schedule	5
QA/QC	5
Past Performance	5
Geographical Balance	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>38</b>

- **GWMP or Program:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. The applicant explains in the application the court jurisdiction of the Basin since 1928 including recent judgments. As an adjudicated basin with adequate supporting documentation, the criterion is fully met. The applicant further explains the need for a Groundwater Management Plan that is consistent with the adjudication as well as other existing accords. The proposed schedule is to begin work on April 1, 2013, which would be applicant's date of resolution of intention to prepare the GWMP. The GWMP would be completed and adopted by April 1, 2015. Documentation of the 2010 Watermaster's report and other water management agreements is provided in Appendix A.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. The application includes a complete, detailed description of the proposed project, including the goals of the proposal and the planning area. The application also describes a well-designed plan for collaboration and dissemination of relevant reports and data by the local public agency with other local public agencies, stakeholders, groundwater users and the general public with regard to the management of the affected groundwater basin. The proposal describes the long-term need for and merit of the proposed project, and identifies a specific, achievable quantity of new knowledge and improvement in groundwater management that will be obtained. The applicant's annual operating budget includes funding for ongoing implementation of the GWMP.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. The work plan describes in detail what will be done and what the work product will be by providing a scope, purpose, goals, and objectives, as well as detailed subtask in the work plan. The tasks are consistent with the schedule and budget and allow reviewers to understand the level of effort of the work being performed, which supports the cost estimates in the budget. The proposed tasks can reasonably fulfill the objectives of the proposal. The tasks constitute a detailed plan for developing a GWMP, designed to improve groundwater management, and present a sound strategy for evaluating performance at each step of the proposed project; identifies the deliverables for assessing progress and accomplishments; and includes quarterly progress and final reports. The work plan describes the scope of the proposed project and includes a description and map of GWMP area, specifically addresses how to the public, stakeholders, agencies, and other interested parties will be involved in the planning process and will receive project information. The project will not involve field work or physical damage to the environment therefore, CEQA and other regulatory environmental permits will not be required for this project. The proposal states that this project is not expected to need access to private property.



# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## *IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013*

---

- **Budget:** The criterion is not fully addressed and did not provide thorough documentation. The budget is consistent with and supported by the work plan and schedule and presents the cost share and grant share amounts broken down by task. Supporting information for the budget includes labor categories, hourly rates, and labor time estimates. However, the Budget contains numerous errors that amount to tens of thousands of dollars. For example, Table 6-1 presents grant funds short \$17,740 for Task 7. Additionally, The explanatory text for Table 6-3 Task 2 states that the task will cost \$57,296 but the supporting table only accounts for \$27,175; the Task 2 grant funding total is missing \$9,540 of grant funds for subtask 2.2. Due to these inaccuracies it is difficult to determine what the actual costs are and whether those costs are realistic for the proposed project.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. The schedule includes timelines that are realistic for the work to be performed and agrees with work plan sequencing and the budget, and the start and end dates are within the PSP designated time frame. The schedule indicates that they will be ready to proceed when funding becomes available in April 2013. The schedule includes a date for adoption of a GWMP within two years after the applicant's resolution of intention to prepare the GWMP.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. The application provides well-defined, appropriate Quality Assurance and Quality Control data objectives and details for each task. Because this is a proposal to develop a GWMP and does not include field work, lab work, or construction, this section primarily addresses procedures for conducting the planning process, reviewing plans, and monitoring progress.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation. The application provides examples that demonstrate capability to perform high quality work, manage funds, and meet deadlines for similar types of projects and documentation to support these claims. The application provides a copy of the project completion letter from DWR for their 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, as well as USBR grant close-out letter.